

Development Management Committee

5 March 2025

Present

Dr M Havard (Chair)

Councillor M Bowen, Councillor D Clements, Councillor T Evans, Councillor C George, Councillor Dr SL Hancock, Dr R Heath-Davies, Mrs S Hoss, Councillor M James, Mr GA Jones, Councillor S Skyrme-Blackhall, Dr RM Plummer, Councillor B Price, Councillor V Thomas, Councillor A Tinley, Councillor M Wiggins and Councillor C Williams.

Officers in attendance

Mrs K Attrill, (Development Management Manager), Mr C Felgate (Solicitor), Ms B Gledhill (Planning Officer), Mr M Kent (Monitoring Officer), Mrs S Morris (Director of Place and Engagement), Mrs C Llewellyn (Minutes)

[Virtual meeting 10.00am – 11.20am;
11.30am – 1.15pm]

1. **Apologies**

An apology for absence was received from Mrs J James.

2. **Disclosures of interest**

The following Member(s)/Officer(s) disclosed an interest in the application(s) and/or matter(s) referred to below:

Application and Reference	Member(s)/Officer(s)	Action taken
General Declaration	Dr R Plummer	Remained in the meeting and played a full part in the discussion and voting
Minutes 6(b) below NP/24/0454/FUL Change of use from lifeboat storage unit to takeaway food outlet (A1) – Former Inshore Lifeboat Store, Tenby Harbour, Tenby	Councillor S Skyrme-Blackhall	Remained in the meeting and played a full part in the discussion and voting



3. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on the 29 January 2025 were presented for confirmation and signature.

On the proposal of Councillor James, seconded by Councillor Skyrme-Blackhall, it was **resolved** that the minutes of the meeting held on the 29 January 2025 be confirmed and signed.

Noted.

4. Members' Duties in Determining Applications

The Solicitor's report summarised the role of the Committee within the planning system, with particular focus on the purposes and duty of the National Park. It went on to outline the purpose of the planning system and relevant considerations in decision making, and the Solicitor added that consideration also needed to be given to the National Development Framework - Future Wales: The National Plan 2040 adopted by the Welsh Government on 24 February 2021 as well as its own Local Development Plan 2. The report also noted that the Authority also had a duty to carry out sustainable development, ecological considerations which included the role of the Environment Wales Act 2016, human rights considerations, the Authority's guidance to members on decision-making in committee and also set out some circumstances where costs might be awarded against the Authority on appeal. Finally, the Solicitor added that the report didn't mention that the Authority's decisions were subject to the scrutiny of the courts and could be subject to a judicial review and it was therefore important that they were lawfully based.

Noted.

5. Right to speak at Committee

The Chairman informed Members that due notification (prior to the stipulated deadline) had been received from interested parties who wished to exercise their right to speak at the meeting that day. In accordance with the decision of the National Park Authority of 7th December 2011, amended 16 June 2021, speakers would have 5 minutes to speak unless they had spoken on the same application previously when they would have 3 minutes in which to present new information (*the interested parties are listed below against their respective application(s), and in the order in which they addressed the Committee*):

Reference number	Proposal	Speaker
NP/24/0567/FUL Minute 6(a) refers	Demolition of existing toilets/showers/store/ laundry building (removal of touring	Mr Mike Harris (Applicant)



caravans for reception) to an alternative site outside flood zone, with expansion with replacement toilets/showers /store/laundry/reception office building with ecological and landscape enhancements (revision of refused application NP/23/0534/FUL) – Newgale Coast Holiday Park, Newgale Camping Site, Newgale

NP/24/0454/FUL Minute 6(b) refers	Change of use from lifeboat storage unit to takeaway food outlet (A1) – Former Inshore Lifeboat Store, Tenby Harbour, Tenby	Mr Alistair Mackay (on behalf of Tenby Sailing Club) - objector Ms Ruby Goodrick – Applicant
---	---	--

6. Report of Planning Applications

The Committee considered the detailed reports of the Development Management Team Leader, together with any updates reported verbally on the day and recorded below. The Committee determined the applications as follows (*the decision reached on each follows the details of the relevant application*):

- (a) Reference: NP/0567/FUL
 Proposal: Demolition of existing toilets/showers/store/ laundry building (removal of touring caravans for reception) to an alternative site outside flood zone, with expansion with replacement toilets/showers /store/laundry/reception office building with ecological and landscape enhancements (revision of refused application NP/23/0534/FUL)
 Location: Newgale Coast Holiday Park, Newgale Camping Site, Newgale, Haverfordwest, SA62 6AS

It was reported that this application sought consent for a replacement facilities block on a site adjacent to the floodplain at Newgale campsite. The application followed the refusal of a previous scheme on the same site in 2024.

Due to the potential for intensification of a use within the flood plain, the replacement building was considered to be unsympathetic to the local



landscape, and the subsequent visual impacts on the special qualities of the National Park, the recommendation was to refuse planning permission.

At the meeting, the officer explained the history of the site, and noted that the current application site was outside of both the flood zone and the coastal change zone. The design of the building had been simplified from that previously sought, however although there were not significantly more facilities than in the existing facilities block, the building was longer due to the provision of a reception area. It was noted that the floor space of the ancillary caravans had not been counted within the existing floor space figure as these were currently unauthorised.

Members were reminded of the Newgale Coastal Adaptation report which advised that management of the road had resulted in the shingle bank being held in an unnatural position, and when the road was re-routed, the bank was likely to establish itself over the area of the road and possibly reduce in height, leading to a greater visual impact and the potential for increased flooding. However it was acknowledged that the Atkins Realis report suggested that the shingle bank could move, but limited weight had been given to the report as it did not form Policy.

In terms of updates, the officer advised that no further information had been received from the applicant, and therefore the response from Natural Resources Wales (NRW) would be classed as an objection due to a lack of landscape impact assessment. She also noted that a number of emails had been received from the applicant and his agent and she responded verbally to their concerns stating that the Tree and Landscape Officer's comments had related only to planting and not the wider landscape, and that points raised in the letters of support had been summarised in the report. She clarified that intensification of use may result from movement of the facilities building outside of the flood zone, and thus be available for more of the year, while the campsite and its users remained within. She considered that this posed an added risk to those in tents which hadn't been addressed within the applicant's flood consequences assessment.

In response to the statement that use of the two caravans as ancillary was a matter of interpretation, officers disagreed, as the certificate of lawfulness was for the site only, and not the ancillary caravans. It was clarified that they could be used while the site was in operation and should be removed at other times; their use for any other purpose would require planning permission. Provision of a permanent reception to assist with Visit Wales recognition was not a matter that could be accorded significant weight and the economic benefit of such accreditation did not outweigh the sustainability issues and visual impact on the landscape.



There was no concern regarding the impact of the campsite on services in neighbouring centres, and it was not possible to compare the situation with the appeal referred to in the applicants' recent letter as no reference had been provided.

In response to Members' questions, officers clarified that no information had been received in respect of lighting, but a stringent lighting condition would be applied to any consent and that the anticipated lifespan of a residential building was usually assumed to be 100 years (and that she would check the lifespan of a commercial building) and officers were concerned that this was longer than that of the site, sustainability being one of the reasons for refusal. Members asked about the role of the Shoreline Management Plan and were advised that this carried significant weight and drew Members' attention to paragraph 2.1.29 of the report which set out the current and future position outlined in the document. Officers also confirmed that the pitches on the site were permitted under two separate applications (NP/98/0349 Certificate of Lawfulness Application for use of camping site for tents and dormobiles and NP/12/0571/FUL for change of use of 30 tent and dormobile pitches to 30 touring unit pitches), however all of the units were located within the floodzone. Finally, it was clarified that the shingle bank was managed by Pembrokeshire County Council as the Highway Authority and they had advised they would not continue to maintain it after 2030.

The applicant, Mike Harris, then addressed the Committee. He explained that he had owned the campsite since 2018 and had invested his savings, energy and passion into enhancing Newgale as a tourism destination. He noted that he had made a formal complaint to the Authority regarding the impartiality of the Committee report and would have liked the Authority to defer its consideration.

Mr Harris explained that planning permission was needed to secure the long term future of the campsite, and that this was the fourth application seeking relocation of the current outdated facilities out of the flood zone. He believed that the proposal relocated an unsightly and outdated building out of the flood zone, further from the road, and beach and to an inconspicuous location in accordance with Policy 37.

He stated that 10 of the 11 statutory consultees had expressed no objection provided conditions were met, including NRW which had no objection to the relocation plans. He noted the objection from Nolton and Roch Community Council but pointed out that the proposed building was in fact smaller when the floor space of the existing trailers was included. Mr Harris noted that the design of the proposal had been amended to reflect an agricultural look and while visible from certain parts of the beach, would not be visible from the sea. He stated that the



Pembrokeshire County Council Encast(?) project had confirmed that the site remained viable for another 40-100 years. The site would not be expanded or commercialised as a result of the proposed building, and he was committed to preserving the landscape at Newgale and providing improved flood resistant facilities for visitors and the ongoing viability of the campsite.

Mr Harris concluded by saying that refusal of the application would condemn a 90 year old business to the floodplain and he asked the Committee to support the application to support tourism and the economy in Pembrokeshire as well as allowing over 16,000 visitors each year to continue to enjoy the freedom and affordable fun provided by the campsite.

Members asked how campers were alerted to the risk of flooding and Mr Harris replied that the campsite was subject to flooding from the river, rather than the sea, and he was signed up to the flood alert service and was able to disseminate that information and move people in plenty of time to an area outside of the flood plain; he estimated that 60% of the campsite was within the flood zone. He added that flooding took place between November and February, generally when campers were not on the site. He noted that 120 units were allowed on the campsite, this being limited by the licence for the facilities available, rather than as a result of the certificate of lawfulness.

A number of Members were of the opinion that tidying up the site by replacing the existing building and removing the unauthorised caravans would be an improvement as well as being of benefit to the local economy and providing affordable accommodation for visitors. However others considered that, although the design of the proposal had improved, it would still have a visual impact due to its size, and commented that images showing the building in the landscape would have helped with the decision. They were also uncomfortable about supporting a new building when it was uncertain how long the business it was serving would continue to operate due to its location in the flood zone.

On the proposal of Dr Hancock, seconded by Dr Heath Davies the officer recommendation of refusal was moved. When put to the vote this was carried.

Decision: That the application be refused for the following reasons:

1. The application represents an unsustainable form of development which may lead to an intensification of a use within a defined flood zone, contrary to the principles of PPW12 paragraph 1.2, 2.5 (long-term benefit), it is also of a larger scale than existing authorised buildings on



site and would therefore be contrary to the requirements of Policy 37 (Relocation and replacement of development (other than residential) affected by coastal change) and Policy 35 (Development in the Coastal Change Management Area).

2. Due to its scale, design and prominent location the proposal is also considered likely to result in a visually intrusive development which would harm special qualities including the landscape character of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park in this location. This is contrary to the provisions of Policy 8 (Special Qualities), Policy 14 (Conservation of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park), Policy 29 (Sustainable Design), Policy 30 (Amenity) and Policy 42 (Site Facilities on Camping, Chalet and Caravan Sites). Insufficient information has been provided regarding landscaping to provide assurance that the proposal can acceptably harmonise with or enhance the landform in this location (contrary to the requirements of Policy 14 (Conservation and enhancement of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park) and SPG on Sustainable Design.

- (b) Reference: NP/24/0454/FUL
Proposal: Change of use from lifeboat storage unit to takeaway food outlet (A1)
Location: Former Inshore Lifeboat Store, Tenby Harbour, Tenby

It was reported that this application sought permission for the change of use of an existing lifeboat storage building, located at Tenby Harbour, into a cold food takeaway Class A1. There were to be no external changes to the building, other than the installation of a fascia sign, which was subject to a separate advertisement consent (Minute 6(c) refers). The site was located within Tenby's designated Conservation Area.

During the consultation process, objections had been received from the Authority's Buildings Conservation Officer, Tenby Town Council and Tenby Civic Society. Careful consideration had been given to this proposal, especially in relation to the context of the use within the Harbour area. Whilst it was acknowledged that the proposed use would introduce a retail element to this area of the Harbour, on balance, Officers considered that no significant harm would be caused to the character of Tenby Harbour as a result of this development since the use proposed occupied a relatively small floor area, and would not be a destination in and of itself, rather, it would rely on the existing footfall within the harbour. It would also have the benefit of bringing an empty building back into use.

It was noted that this application was a departure from the Local Development Plan as it proposed a retail use outside of the defined retail centre, however, the scale and nature of retail use proposed was not considered to be of a type which would have an adverse impact upon the retail hierarchy by virtue of being located in close proximity to and within



the settlement boundary for Tenby. Overall, the proposal was deemed to be acceptable, and as such, the recommendation was to grant permission, following the expiration of the press notice, subject to no new material considerations being raised as a result.

At the meeting, the officer noted that two additional representations had been received since the time of writing the report and summarised the main concerns raised as lack of rubbish bins, toilet facilities, sewerage and drainage to the unit and no public seating which could impact on private property, noise and an upset to the balance of operations in that area of the harbour. It was also clarified that no additional internal lights were proposed.

An additional condition was recommended to require full details of water delivery, storage, management and collection to be submitted prior to commencement of operation.

Given the objection from the Building Conservation Officer, Members asked him to outline his concerns. He advised that this was a finely balanced case, as there was little impact on the appearance of the Conservation Area, there being no change to the 1970's building, apart from a sign, and he felt that the character would be preserved as the business would operate in the daytime only (noting the proposed condition to restrict hours of use) and was outside of the core of the harbour area and should not impinge on the working harbour. On balance he felt that the application did preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, and following discussions with the officer and consideration of the suggested conditions, he was now content with the application.

Officers also clarified that the building did not have independent access to drainage, that the use was cold food sales only – there was no seating or café use proposed and that the building was currently empty.

The first speaker was Alistair Mackay, speaking on behalf of Tenby Sailing Club, Tenby Harbour Users Association and other neighbouring properties. Their main concern was the conflict between customers and others who use the harbour to launch craft or load/unload boats from the slipway in front of the property, which was at times congested. He noted that this was compounded when vehicles travel to and from the north beach to the harbour and pass this bottleneck and neighbouring properties had expressed concern about the collection of waste water. Mr Mackay noted that the officers report did not address congestion issues, and he did not accept the statement that the business would rely on existing footfall and feared that people would queue for the business and impede the normal activities of harbour users. He was disappointed



that Pembrokeshire County Council had awarded the lease for the building contrary to its own condition that use of the building should be compatible with the nature of the harbour and not compete with existing businesses.

Mr Mackay noted that Local Development Plan sought to protect and enhance the harbour area and he questioned the departure from the plan in respect of the development's location outside of the retail centre of Tenby. He also considered the report to be misleading as the nearest residential properties were above, in Crackwell Street, and believed that anyone staying in those properties would be affected.

In response to a question from a Member, Mr Mackay continued outlining his concerns in respect of use of the alcove adjacent to the property being used by patrons of the café and he noted that many harbour users had expressed an interest in using the space when it was advertised, however he acknowledged it was up to the County Council to award the lease. Mr Mackay also questioned the offer of providing a bird feeder as feeding birds in public spaces caused nuisance. The Chair noted that this latter point had been addressed in the suggested conditions.

Other Members asked about use of the harbour during the Tenby Regatta, and Mr Mackay advised that there were a number of sailing club, regatta and championship events at the harbour between April and Christmas, with 70 - 100 boats stored along the North Walk or on the beach. He stated that at those times, the slipway was congested and busy and could prove a hazard for pedestrians. He was particularly concerned that these visitors would not understand what was going on in the harbour area and would be less sympathetic to the work of the harbour.

The Development Management Manager noted that in response to Mr Mackay's point about nearby residential properties in Crackwell Street, that the closest room was not a main living area and therefore less weight had been given to that.

The next speaker was the applicant, Ruby Goodrick. She explained that the old store had been empty for 2 years and she believed that bringing it back into use would enhance the harbour. She would ensure no harm to the integrity of a well loved location and there would be no external changes other than a small sign. Internally there would be no intrusive lighting and a spacious waiting room was proposed to prevent queues forming outside.

Ms Goodrick advised that vehicular access to the area was restricted and that it was physically impossible to drive past. She explained that she



had followed all the required procedures including seeking pre-planning advice and undertaking a flood risk assessment. In response to the concerns expressed regarding opening hours (originally 10am – 10pm to allow for opening during the summer spectaculars), she advised that she was happy to adjust the hours.

She noted that the business would contribute to the local economy providing job opportunities, business to a local waste removal service and through sourcing local fresh ingredients as well as high quality coffee. The customer base was anticipated to be dog walkers and tourists, but a phone delivery service would be offered to local businesses. She concluded by saying that having grown up in Tenby, when her mother had run a business in the town, she wanted to bring Truly Scrumptious back to life and be part of Tenby's future, to be a small part of what kept it special.

Members asked about the volume of waste water and the means of collecting it and the applicant advised that it would be collected in tanks and removed by van at the end of each day. The officer confirmed that Environmental Health legislation was relevant and added that a waste management condition was proposed. It was also noted that there was a proposed condition to prevent use of the roof, and if Members were so minded, it would be possible to impose a temporary 2-year condition to allow the practicalities of the suggested use of the site to be tested.

While they commended the enterprise and initiative of the applicant, Members were concerned about the storage and removal of waste water, congestion in the harbour area and the location of the business in a harbour setting where a marine based use would be more appropriate. A motion of refusal was proposed by Councillor Hancock, seconded by Dr Plummer. Reasons given for going against the officer recommendation were the location of the site outside the defined retail centre of the town, siting, design and impact on the special qualities of the National Park (policies 8, 14, 29 and 56)

The Solicitor advised that the Director had had to leave the meeting and had delegated the decision of whether to invoke the cooling off procedure, should Members go against the officer recommendation, to the Development Management Manager. Ms Attrill advised that she would not invoke the procedure.

When put to the vote, the application was refused.

Decision: That the application be refused for the following reasons:



1. **The location is outside of the town centre boundary and the proposed use in this location is contrary to Policy 56 (Retail in the National Park) and Policy 57 (Town and District Shopping Centres) of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Authority Local Development Plan 2.**
2. **The proposal would be incompatible with its location and would harm the special qualities of the National Park contrary to Policy 8 (Special Qualities), Policy 14 (Conservation and Enhancement of Pembrokeshire Coast National Park) and Policy 29 (Sustainable Design) of the adopted Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Authority Local Development Plan 2.**

- (c) Reference: NP/24/0670/ADV
Proposal: Fascia sign board to face of property
Location: The Old Lifeboat Store, Tenby Harbour, Penniless Cove, Tenby

It was reported that this application sought advertisement consent for the display of a fascia board sign to the front of the property. The application was being considered alongside application reference NP/24/0454/FUL (Minutes 6(b) refers), which was for the associated change of use from boat storage to cold food takeaway. The proposed fascia sign would replace the former fascia signage which was displayed on the building.

The application was presented to the Development Management Committee as the Town Council had objected to the application, contrary to the Officer recommendation for approval. It was reported that one representation had been received since the Committee report had been written, however the content mainly related to the change of use of the building, rather than the proposed signage. It was also clarified that no illuminated signage was proposed.

Officers had concluded that, having regard to all matters raised, the proposed signage would not have an adverse impact upon the special qualities of the National Park, amenity, nor public safety. As such, it was considered to be in accordance with Policies 1, 8, 14, 29 of the LDP2, PPW12, and TAN 7, and that the application for advertisement consent should be approved in accordance with the requirements of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) regulations 1992 (as amended) and Technical Advice Note (TAN) 7 (Outdoor Advertisement Control).

Although planning permission for the change of use of the unit had been refused (Minute 6(b) refers), the officer clarified that the application still had to be determined on its merits, as the applicant might wish to



continue to progress it and could appeal the decision. When asked, the applicant confirmed that she did not wish to withdraw the application.

Some Members were concerned that should the advertisement consent be granted, the sign could be erected even though the use had been refused. A motion to refuse the application was proposed by Dr Heath-Davies, seconded by Councillor Skyrme-Blackhall.

The Solicitor advised Members to consider carefully such a motion, as he believed there was potential for the applicant to appeal such a decision which could result in an award of costs against the Authority. Councillor Clements then proposed deferral of the application, to allow officers an opportunity to consider case law, and after taking advice from the Solicitor she then suggested delegation of the decision to officers to determine the application in consultation with the Chair and Deputy Chair of the Committee. The motion of refusal was withdrawn and Dr Heath-Davies seconded the motion to delegate. When put to the vote, this was carried. Officers assured the Committee that if the Chair and Deputy Chair were not happy with what was being suggested, the application would be brought back before the Committee for determination.

Decision: That the application be delegated to officers to determine the application in consultation with the Chair and Deputy Chair of the Committee

7. Appeals

The Development Management Team Leader reported on 11 appeals (against planning decisions made by the Authority) that were currently lodged with the Welsh Government, and detailed which stage of the appeal process had been reached to date in every case.

Decisions were reported in respect of NP/22/0675/MOD Proposed discharge of Section 106 Agreement – Penpant Farm, Nine Wells, Solva, which was allowed and NP/23/0246/FUL Change of use of pitch & putt area & expansion with 10 self-contained bespoke mobile lodges/caravans & car parking together with ecological enhancements – Tretio Caravan & Camping Park, St Davids which was dismissed.

The Solicitor noted that the Authority had undertaken a successful prosecution at the Ridgeway, Manorbier and had obtained an injunction to remove the majority of items on the site and prevent anything further being brought onto it. An award of costs to the Authority had also been made. He also added that with regards to the Judicial Review of the site at Moylegrove, a preliminary hearing had been held on 13th and 14th March at which the judge had agreed that all five grounds could now be argued at the trial, which would take place on 17th/18th/19th June.

Noted.



The Minutes of this meeting were confirmed at the meeting of the Development Management Committee held on 9 April 2025 without amendment

